

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 16, 18 and 26 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections based on these amendment and the remarks set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner's comment of the office action states the application would be allowable if:

- A. claims 1 and 18 are amended to include the statement "*wherein the short-circuit current flow heats the wire to a melting temperature of the wire*";
- B. claims 16 and 18 are amended to change "*the or each pair*" to "*the at least one pair*";
- C. claim 26 is amended to change "*of said wire connecting*" to "*of said wire with the short circuit current flow connecting*"

Applicant has made amendments B and C as stated above.

Regarding amendment A, the applicant would like to alter the suggested amendment to "*A wire-strike system including: a non-explosive wire cutter....*"

The cited prior art, *Emigh et al.* does include a pair of conductive electrodes. However, the electrodes function solely as a triggering means and play no part in actually cutting the impacted wire. The *Emigh et al.* wire cutting is performed solely by the destructive effects of the explosive cutting charges (16) & (44). Indeed, while the explosive charges are the germane component in the wire cutting, the conductive electrodes (48) in the embodiment referred to in figures 3 and 4 are only one of several means (col 4, lines 31

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 31 2009

– 38) of triggering the explosive charges and are not indispensable. In contrast, the present invention is intrinsically reliant on current flow through the electrodes to at least partially sever the wire and consequently they are present in every embodiment.

Moreover, when a moving aircraft impacts a wire in flight, the kinetic energy of the impact contributes to the severing of the wire at the contact point of the wire and electrodes, in combination with the mechanical weakening of the wire due to the electrical heating. Therefore, the instance of severing the wire may occur in an instance before the wire is totally melted at the contact point with the electrodes. Therefore, inclusion of such a criteria in the independent claims would be unduly restrictive given the present invention is already distinguished from *Emigh et al.* by the above criteria that the wire cutter is non-explosive.

CONCLUSION

We submit all the objections have been traversed and that claim 1 is now in order for allowance.

The applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-26 being dependant on the same wording as claim 1 are now also in condition for allowance

Respectfully submitted,

ARCIT LIMITED

Dated: Aug 30 2009

James Donald Law.

James Donald Law, et al.
Application No. 10/576,903

Page 8

Examiner: Kreiner, M.
Group Art Unit: 4174